

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. NO.: 3878-02
BILL NO.: HCS for HB 1733
SUBJECT: Construction and Building Codes; Public Buildings
TYPE: Original
DATE: March 9, 2000

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
General Revenue	(\$125,000)	(\$129,375)	(\$133,903)
Parks Sales Tax Fund	(\$104,250)	(\$100,425)	(\$110,599)
Conservation Commission Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	(\$229,250 to Unknown)	(\$229,800 to Unknown)	(\$244,502 to Unknown)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Local Government	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

In a similar previous proposal, officials from the **Office of Administration, Division of Facilities Management** assumed this proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

Officials from the **Office of Administration, Division of Design and Construction** assume this proposal would cost the state approximately \$125,000 in FY 01, \$129,375 in FY 02 and \$133,903 in FY 03. Based on a review of the Governor's Recommended Capital Improvement Plan for FY 00 - FY 02, 20 projects would have potential impact. The estimated cost per restroom (ADA compliant) is \$12,500. Assuming the FY 00 - 01 sampling represents an average capital cycle, 10 projects can be expected annually with a cost of \$12,500 each, giving an average unescalated cost of \$125,000.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume that over the next ten years, 57 restroom facilities within the state park system will have to be renovated or constructed to meet the specifications detailed in HB 1733. The renovations or constructions include the shower houses, bathhouses and restrooms located throughout the state that presently contain three or more toilets. The fiscal impact is difficult to project, as each renovation would be different.

47 bathhouses / shower houses @ \$18,750 each	= \$881,250
12 Visitor centers @ \$11,250 each	= \$135,000
7 Park lodges / Motels @ \$11,250	= \$ 78,750
<u>10 Beach bathhouses @ \$18,000 each</u>	<u>= \$180,000</u>
	\$1,275,000
OA Administrative Cost	= <u>\$191,250</u>
TOTAL COST IMPACT	\$1,466,250

The DNR noted as stated previously, the cost estimate for the bathhouses/showerhouses assumes each would also contain a shower, which is consistent with the existing bathhouses and showerhouses, while the restrooms would contain a sink and toilet. The Department assumes these capital improvements would take place as CI funds in the Parks Sales Tax were available and upon appropriation.

In a similar previous proposal, **Oversight** stated the Governor's Recommended Capital Improvement Plan for FY 00 and FY 01 identified six (6) projects for DNR over the next two fiscal years. DNR is assuming construction costs will be incurred beginning FY 01. Therefore, the projected cost for FY 01 would be \$104,250, which represents the construction of 4

ASSUMPTION (continued)

bathroom/showerhouse, 1 beach bathroom and 1 visitor center $((4 \times \$18,750) + (1 \times \$18,000) + (1 \times \$11,250))$. Using the same assumptions, six (6) additional projects will be scheduled for FY 02 and FY 03 for a projected cost of \$100,425 and \$110,599, respectively, adjusted for inflation, with the remaining costs incurred in the other years.

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC)** assume this proposal would result in fiscal impact on MDC funds because of its effect on new construction; however, the extent of fiscal impact is unknown.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation (DHT)** assume this proposal would have no fiscal impact on its agency. In a similar previous proposal, the DHT had assumed costs; however, subsequently, the DHT has anticipated such requirements in future construction projects and has already included such costs in construction contracts.

In a similar previous proposal, officials from **Southwest Missouri State University** assumed this proposal would have no fiscal impact on the University. The proposal exempts several entities, including schools. Therefore, as long as the University is still considered a school according to state definitions, the University would be exempt from the proposal.

In a similar previous proposal, officials from **Truman State University** assumed this proposal could cost \$48,000 in FY 01, \$80,000 in FY 02, and \$80,000 in FY 03, based on construction projects currently planned for the next three fiscal years.

Officials from the **University of Missouri** estimated this legislation will cost the University approximately \$3.5 million within the next ten years for additional construction required in new and renovated facilities.

Oversight assumes the Universities would be exempt from the requirements of this proposal and has not included costs associated with Universities in the fiscal impact specifications below.

Officials from **Southeast Missouri State University** did not respond to our fiscal note request.

Officials from the **City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Jackson County and the City of Springfield** did not respond to our fiscal note request. Oversight assumes that each of these entities would incur costs over the next three fiscal years in renovating or constructing new public buildings and therefore would be required to install unisex restrooms; however, the fiscal impact is not readily determinable. Therefore, Oversight is showing local government costs as (Unknown).

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2001 (6 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
---	--------------------	---------	---------

GENERAL REVENUE

<u>Costs - Office of Administration</u>	<u>(\$125,000)</u>	<u>(\$129,375)</u>	<u>(\$133,903)</u>
---	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

PARKS SALES TAX FUND

<u>Cost - construction of unisex restrooms</u>	<u>(\$104,250)</u>	<u>(\$100,425)</u>	<u>(\$110,599)</u>
--	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND

<u>Cost - construction of unisex restrooms</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
--	------------------	------------------	------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2001 (6 Mo.)	FY 2002	FY 2003
---	--------------------	---------	---------

<u>Costs - Political Subdivisions</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Businesses that have public restrooms with two or more toilets, such as a mall, shopping center, etc. would be required to comply with the provisions of this proposal and therefore would have some fiscal impact.

DESCRIPTION

This bill requires public facilities such as sports stadiums, auditoriums, and shopping malls which are built after January 1, 2001, to provide one family restroom for every pair of male and female restrooms which have 3 or more toilets. Family restrooms are required to have a privacy latch and comply with all state and federal laws regarding access for persons with disabilities.

L.R. NO. 3878-02
BILL NO. HCS for HB 1733
PAGE 5 OF 5
March 9, 2000

DESCRIPTION (continued)

The bill also requires a privacy latch for entrances to restrooms which have no more than 2 toilets. Such restrooms are required to comply with all state and federal laws regarding access for persons with disabilities.

Facilities constructed prior to January 1, 2001, which undergo a major structural renovation are required to provide family restrooms or privacy latches for restroom entrances. Churches, schools, private clubs, places owned and operated by religious corporations, associations and societies, or any other establishment not open to the public are not required to provide family restrooms.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of Administration
Division of Facilities Management
Division of Design and Construction
Department of Natural Resources
Missouri Department of Conservation
Department of Transportation
Southwest Missouri State University
Truman State University
University of Missouri

NOT RESPONDING: Southeast Missouri State University, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Jackson County, City of Springfield



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA
Director
March 9, 2000